

### REMARKS

In the subject Office Action the Examiner called for an election of species while defining Claims 1 and 12 as generic. After Applicant's election the Examiner withdrew Claims 10, 11 and 20 from consideration as non-elected species. As Applicant has herein amended Claim 1 to be allowable and has avoided the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 rejection of Claim 12, it is submitted that as both claims are generic and allowable, the withdrawal of Claims 10, 11 and 20 is no longer supported and should be rescinded such that all three claims are reinstated in the application.

Applicant has amended a number of the paragraphs of the Specification, the Abstract and certain claims to correct minor typographical and syntax errors. The purposes of the various such amendments will be apparent. The amendments do not change the scope or concept of the claimed invention. All amendments of this type called for by the Examiner have been made. (Applicant assumes that the Examiner's call for correction of the word "tends" on page 2, line 6 of the third paragraph, was meant to refer to the third paragraph on page 1, and that has been corrected accordingly. All other occurrences of the word "tend" appear to be correct in their contexts.)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3 and 12 and claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 for lack of antecedent support for "said spring." Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 12 to provide such support, avoiding the rejection.

The Examiner also rejected the same claims under § 112, ¶ 1 for lack of antecedent support for "the up force side" and "the down force side" and requested clarification of both phrases. Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 12 to provide such antecedent support, thus avoiding the rejection. For clarification, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to numerous places in the Specification and drawings where there is description of how the centrifugal forces arising when a car makes a turn cause the weight of the car to be shifted to place an added unbalanced force on the suspension spring on the outer side of the turn, which is thus compressed, and to unload the force on the suspension spring on the inner side of the turn. The outer side where the added force is thus applied is defined as the "down force side," since the added force is downward to compress the

spring on that side, and the inner side where the force is unloaded is defined as the "up force side," since unloading of the spring of that side allows the spring to decompress and extend upwardly. See, for instance, page 4, ¶ 6; page 6, ¶¶ 2 and 3, and Figures 3 and 6. It is submitted that the Specification thus clearly identifies the two sides and that the labels applied for convenience in this application are clear, easily understood and logically correct. Applicant thus has overcome the § 112, ¶ 1 rejection has been fully avoided.

The Examiner also rejected a number of claims (including Claims 1 and 12 and several claims dependent therefrom) as anticipated by Kolbe (USP 2,869,747) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or as obvious over Kolbe in view of Fujita (USP 4,632,413) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), but indicated that the remainder of the claims (Claims 2, 3 and 13-19) would be allowable if rewritten to avoid the § 112, ¶ 1 rejection. Applicant has herein amended Claims 1 and 12, and cancelled Claims 2 and 13, to insert the limitations of Claims 2 and 13 into Claims 1 and 12, respectively, to place Claims 1 and 12 in allowable form. Those claims now being allowance as amended, it follows that the claims dependent therefrom are also allowable, such that for all claims remaining in the application, the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) have been avoided.

It is thus submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been fully responded to and avoided or traversed.

### **FEES**

Other than the extension of time for response fee for which payment is noted above, it is not believed that any fees are due with respect to the amendment of the claims herein. However, should any such fees be due, the Patent and Trademark Office is authorized to charge all such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1990.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been avoided and/or traversed. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to enter the amendments herein, reinstate the non-elected

claims, reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections and allow Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20, as amended, all claims in the case following amendment.

Should the Examiner believe that prosecution of this application might be expedited by further discussion of the issues, a telephone call to the undersigned attorney, collect, at the telephone number listed below, is cordially invited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 24, 2004

By: 

James W. McClain, Reg. No. 24,536  
Attorney for Applicant

GORDON & REES LLP  
1660 Union Street  
San Diego, California 92101-2926

Telephone: (619) 238-0999  
Facsimile: (619) 238-0062  
email: [jmcclain@bmhm.com](mailto:jmcclain@bmhm.com)  
Docket No.: 8638 PA07